

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**I. The § 112 Rejections**

Claims 28-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the term "cellular-like telephone environment" is a relative term not defined in the specification. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As described in the specification at page 7, lines 1-4, "a cellular-like telephone environment" is created - or defined - by "two-way radio communication between a cordless unit and multiple base stations". Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claims 28-29 is described in the specification in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

**II. The § 102/103 Rejections**

Claims 8-9, 16-17, and 28-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,539,237 ("Sayers").

Claims 10-12, 14, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sayers in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0131598 ("Chiu").

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 8 recites a method for sending a call from a cordless phone system to a device. The cordless phone system includes a cordless unit and a base station, and is coupled to an internet service provider through a first modem. The method includes utilizing the cordless unit to initial the call. If the cordless unit is within range of the first base station, then the call is routed to the ISP via the first modem, otherwise, the call is routed to the ISP via a second modem

that is coupled to a second base station, which second base station is within range of the cordless unit.

As acknowledged by the Examiner in the Action dated January 18, 2006, Applicant's claim is directed to a phone system with multiple base stations where the base station within range acts as a conduit for communication. However, the "base station" recited in claim 8 is explicitly directed to a base station of a cordless phone system, as described in the specification at page 6, line 20 – page 7, line 4, and not that of a base station associated with a cellular telephone. The novelty of Applicant's invention (in one aspect) is the use of a cordless phone and multiple (cordless phone) base stations to create a cellular-like telephone environment without the use of cellular telephones.

Sayers describes a conventional cellular communication system (as described in the background section of Applicant's specification at page 2, lines 1-14), disclosing the use of cells 11 and associated base transceiver stations 12 which permit users using mobile stations 4 (i.e., cellular phones) to communicate through the GSM protocol for mobile communications (see FIG. 1, col. 2, ll. 40-49). Other than the unique integration of a private wireless network that permits users to freely communicate in both the public and private networks, the basic cellular communication concepts of Sayers were addressed as prior art in Applicant's specification. Sayers' mobile stations 4 (or cellular phones) and base transceiver stations 12 are not equivalent to the cordless unit and base station recited in claim 8. Although the Examiner is entitled to a reasonably broad interpretation of the claim terms, the Examiner must interpret the claims consistent with the specification. MPEP §2111, citing *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Applicant respectfully submits that specification clearly provides a distinction between a conventional cellular phone system and a cordless phone system and, therefore, for the Examiner

Attorney Docket: RPS9200100231US1/2068P

to read a cellular phone system on a "cordless phone system" (as recited in claim 8) contravenes MPEP §2111. Because Sayers is directed towards cellular phone communications, Sayers fails to disclose any the method steps recited in claim 8.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 8, and the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable over Sayers.

Claim 16 incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 8. Claim 16, and the claims that depend therefrom, are also allowable over Sayers for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 8.

Applicant submits that claims 8-12, 14, 16-22, and 28-31 are allowable over the references cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin M. Vivian  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 53,727  
(650) 475-1448

March 14, 2006

Date